

1. Does the proposed residential lot size reduction seem reasonable?	2. Are there any other options that you haven't heard that we should consider?	3. Are we heading in the right direction with these considerations?	4. As you see it, do these considerations meet City goals? Why/why not?	5. Other comments?
To a degree - I would say it needs limitations so you do not increase density too much. A neighborhood will only support so much crowding - so only so many per square mile or neighborhood.	Incentivize "boundary choose usage" of space above downtown commercial spaces	I think you will find it virtually impossible to impact low income rents in today's market. Allowing more discreet growth will prevent us from becoming hyper stratified for the more and more wealthy - we would not gain a lot but would not lose a lot either.	Do not go ahead unless you know it will work - you would destroy what we have for no gain	People don't want a lot of density. That we currently are "under developed" at 3 units per acre tells you people do not want to be crowded in. Do not expand beyond our infrastructure to support.
Yes. Incentives for affordable housing will be critical	Density corridors with affordable units. Mixed use is good. Where will these units be placed? Is the land steep? A creek? Are there large trees? All this needs to be taken into consideration.	What are the downsides of Asheville's continued growth? Is this going to, in the end, destroy why we love Asheville?	I need to know how this fits into a larger picture of the effect of growth on Asheville.	What is the city doing to preserve greenspaces & wildlife corridors? There are already significant traffic problems with inadequate roads and lack of sidewalks. Increasing density as valuable as this might be, needs to go hand in hand with improving & expanding infrastructure.
Too general	See #3	Broaden considerations: traffic/parking; open space/parks; stormwate runoff; not blanket codes (ex. Topography concerns); incentivize low income; mixed use developments	Not clear about definitive City goals.	Partnerships w/surrounding communities re: housing & development with an emphasis on public transportation between municipalities. "Community Houses": more non-related people per household
Too sweeping	Preserve nature & trees. Integrate traffic planning	Need more stormwater consideration. Open sapce consideration. Conservation subdivision		

1. Does the proposed residential lot size reduction seem reasonable?	2. Are there any other options that you haven't heard that we should consider?	3. Are we heading in the right direction with these considerations?	4. As you see it, do these considerations meet City goals? Why/why not?	5. Other comments?
Yes	Incentivize people and developers to build with AUDs (eg basement dwelling) Case by case?	Yes Yes	Yes	Definitely in favor of design guidelines. Do not want large apt complexes (more than quads) in residential areas. Do not want parking guidelines changed. Keep off street requirements for all units.
Yes	Yes - not yet apparent	Yes - Consult more with small scale investment community. Make presentation at CREIA.	It's a start.	Opening single family to multifamily. Transferred development rights.
Yes	Tiny homes on trailers perm foundation/not perm foundation	Yes. Lot area averaging is preferred & duplex areas	To some degree. But housing & rental cost are still too high	Incentives are made for property zoning: owners, fees, and builders; what incentives for sub-contractors and suppliers?
To truly address density; smaller (even smaller) lot sizes should be considered; pocket neighborhoods and cottage communities	Sharing 2-4 ADU-sized homes that meet code on smaller lot sizes	Absolutely. Go smaller! The trend is progressing, Asheville should be at the foreground considering its density issues.	Yes! Density and zoning reduction are hand in hand subjects	Alan was incredibly insightful and open to our concerns and questions as well as accepting of our ideas.
	Yes - could even be bigger than 20% for the larger lots	Definitely	Yes - learn from the past, plan for a future that's sustainable for everyone; "Missing Middle" also increases social equity - gradual transitions make it harder to maintain a "us vs them" mentality	Need to make sure 21st century zoning goals aren't shot in the foot by 20th century parking assumptions. Make sure codes don't require more parking than future residents will actually need.
Seems reasonable	Developing urban neighborhoods with best & most successful in public transportation options, reduce dependency on autos, increase walkability - w/o these considtions in place, additional building can create negatives	Think so - we have to do something. Smaller lot sizes would help.		Interested in thorough discussion of environmental, stormwater factors in conjunction with additional building. How to balance?

1. Does the proposed residential lot size reduction seem reasonable?	2. Are there any other options that you haven't heard that we should consider?	3. Are we heading in the right direction with these considerations?	4. As you see it, do these considerations meet City goals? Why/why not?	5. Other comments?
Yes, good idea	Reduce house sizes for variety of needs	Yes	Yes. I would caution that our growth needs to be balanced with environmental issues that growth/building require	I am glad Asheville is forward thinking
				1) This must happen (I like it) but this is a drop in the housing need bucket 2) This will expose any strain on infrastructure. Any problems will be exacerbated 3) Stormwater runoff! It's a problem now & this will exacerbate it 4) This promotes deforestation. Provide a tree diameter-based incentive to keep big trees!
YES	Nope	Yes - But I have some concerns. See below.	Yes.	
				I suggest training or direct planning assistance for homeowners interested in ADUs and investors with development questions --prior planning assistance before the permitting process has begun & education. Create a news story about how and invitation to an "assistance" meeting
Yes	Not yet	Yes	Yes	
Yes, if it is designed well and doesn't impose on the neighbors. Discreet design will make a big difference.	I would limit the number of AirBNB rooms in the city limits to open up more rooms for residents. There needs to be more vacancies for residents.	Yes, but there is a lot more that can be done. Supporting artisits with housing subsidies would be one. Giving housing stipends to young people to help them purchase real estate is another.	I see it as a beginning. Look at other cities like San Francisco, Seattle, and Portland and learn from their mistakes!	Keep having meetings like this! No to large apartment complexes!!!

1. Does the proposed residential lot size reduction seem reasonable?	2. Are there any other options that you haven't heard that we should consider?	3. Are we heading in the right direction with these considerations?	4. As you see it, do these considerations meet City goals? Why/why not?	5. Other comments?
Yes				What is considered the optimum SQ FTG that balances required space with efficient development
Yes	Large scale - infill is needed and stormwater requirements are burdensome. City owned & maintained systems are better than privately owned systems	Yes	Yes, density helps with sharing infrastructure costs and increases supply - reducing demand, lowering cost	
Yes - I am a real estate agent that sells about 75 homes a year. We need more lots & homes.		Yes, very needed.	Yes - more walkable homes. More homes = less cost for rent & housing	
Yes!	Yes!	Yes!	Yes!	Street view really important
Yes	I am guessing staff has researched what some other cities have done and the results	Absolutely	I am assuming that the goal is to avoid sprawl and yes, if that's the goal	
Yes	Not sure yet	Yes, but it seems like there could be more to be done		
Prefer greater reduction	No	Yes		
Yes.	Potentially investigate alternative lot sizes for tiny homes - say under 500-800 SQ FT. (Similar size to ADUs) Perhaps similar standards but allow subdivision of lot so ADU sized dwellings could be sold & not just rented	Yes	They are moving toward the goals of both City Council' 2036 Vision & the 2025 Comprehensive Plan	Also, some type of financial assistance/incentives should be considered for elderly/disabled homeowners to fix up & remain in their homes as a means of assisting with affordable housing & retaining neighborhood character
Definitely. Could go smaller	I look forward to the other pieces of the comprehensive plan. Would like more incentives for tiny houses	Yes. Keep going even further	It's a start.	Good job!
I would like to see a further reduction of lot width to 25-30%	Increasing buildable height of buildings	Yes	100% Yes	Incentivize net zero development

1. Does the proposed residential lot size reduction seem reasonable?	2. Are there any other options that you haven't heard that we should consider?	3. Are we heading in the right direction with these considerations?	4. As you see it, do these considerations meet City goals? Why/why not?	5. Other comments?
Yes	Obtaining a variance should be a clear, transparent process. P&Z should be as enthusiastic about efficient land use as those presenting tonight.	Yes	Yes	
	Transfer of developer air rights & incentivize developers to go beyond template	Yes, thanks		
Yes, very reasonable. It's a very rational approach to allow density increases	Reduced parking requirements	Yes!	Definitely, I thnk they are in line with city goals	Emphasize the fact that what is being proposed already exists in traditional neighborhoods
Yes, it seems pretty reasonable. However, I think it might be worthwhile to consider reducing lot areas by more than 20%. Why not 25%-30% reductions especially with R16 zoning to better accommodate tiny + small homes?	I'd like you to consider small homes (400 SF & up) + tiny home options (400 SF and down). Specificallly zoning & coding that will allow more of it, similar to cottage zoning codes adopted to these style homes	I think removing barriers to infill development is in the right direction. It seems you're wanting to fill the gap between family dwelling units and high rises. To me, that means larger than family size units. I want the city to consider filling that gap with smaller homes (1000 square feet and less). Specifically as ADUs	I think so.	Reducing right of ways to reduce setbacks would allow for more efficient use of land.